

Vol. 14 No 10 December 1989

Edited, printed and published at Liverpool
 by Dr J. Pinsent & Ms Helena Hurt, BA
 Dept of Classics and Archaeology, The University,
 P.O. Box 147 Liverpool, L69 3BX, Tel. 051-794-2455
 RATES for 1989, 10 issues (not August and September)
 SURFACE £9.50 UK, £10.50 Europe, \$(US)18.50 elsewhere
 AIR £10 Europe, \$(US)27.50 N.America, \$(US)35 Australasia.

CONTENTS of which the authors retain the copyright.
 The editor retains copyright in the format



Everard Flintoft (Leeds): <i>Who is the speaker at Agamemnon 489ff?</i>	147-150
L. A. Holford-Strevens (Oxford): <i>Varia Gelliana et Annianum</i>	151-153
F. M. A. Jones (Liverpool): <i>A note on Lucilius 88-94M.</i>	153-154
Robert Parker (Oriental College, Oxford): <i>Dionysus at Agrai</i>	154-155
Frederick Williams (Queen's University, Belfast): <i>Giving dogs a bad name</i>	155-156
Richard S. Williams (Washington State): <i>Caesar BG 1.1.1. once again</i>	156
Review: C. J. Tuplin (Liverpool)	157-160
P.R. McKechnie & S.J. Kern (ed. & transl.), <i>Hellenica Oxyrhynchia</i> , Warminster, Aris & Phillips, 1988. Pp. iv + 188. £19.95 cloth, £7.50 limp. ISBN 0-85668-357-4 cloth, 358-2 limp	

The Editor has often been told by subscribers that his notes are the most read part of any 'number of *LCM*', but his experience since the last number was sent out leads him to doubt this. For in it subscribers were told of the new accounting procedure adopted at the instance of H.M. Inspector of Taxes, and specifically asked not to remit for 1990 until invoiced with the January number. A number of them, however, immediately did send cheques (and one from North America), and the Editor confesses that he himself was not sorry to receive them, as tokens of the fact that some at least do not, as one did, find 'the cost exorbitant for what is supplied', and to them he is grateful. But their cheques will not be paid in until January.

The schedule of rates enclosed seems to have caused some confusion. One subscriber claimed to take it (or perhaps previous Editor's notes) as some kind of begging letter, of which he did not believe a word. And the financial innocence of academics was displayed by those who do not know what is a *pro forma* invoice (among them, truth to tell, the Editor). It is in fact a statement of what an order would cost to fulfil, and though cast in the form of an invoice is not one unless the recipient chooses so to regard it.

However, another letter came 'from one who approves of Crawley's Thucydides to another' with the welcome information, which some readers may be glad to have, that the translation has been re-issued in paperback in the United States, revised by T. E. Wick with a new introduction and with the normal chapter divisions indicated, published by Modern Library College Editions (Random House), 1982, ISBN 0 394 32978 3, at \$4.75. So if the Editor has lost his old Everyman copy he will have no excuse for not replacing it.

The Editor did not earlier express regret that the subscription had to go up, regarding such expression as hypocritical, for if he really regretted it he would presumably not have done it. Yet he supposes that it is possible to wish for a world in which such actions were not necessary, and if that is what his regrets would have meant, then indeed he has them, and is initiating a number of changes to soften the blow. One is the special rate for students, undergraduate and graduate, and the retired, including, he should have made clear, the early

retired. Another is the abandonment of the system of multiple despatch to Secretaries of Departments in this country, which was instituted to save postage and keep down costs, perhaps a false economy and the wrong way to deal with the problem. For it did mean more work for the Editor, and in future each subscriber will receive his individual copy even if not 'under plain cover'.

But subscribers may not appreciate (again as he did not) the amount of administration generated even by such a small concern as *LCM*. The Editorial Assistant (with some assistance from the Editor and from casual, but remunerated, labour) has nearly completed the reorganisation, or, perhaps better, the organisation, of the office, and the affairs of *LCM* will no longer, if she can help it, be divided between that office (a basement office rented from the University and shared with some of the University's computer equipment) and what in the United States (and indeed increasingly in this country) would be called the Editor's office (for which the University has not yet decided to charge rent, though the exigencies of the new Universities Funding Council may yet force it to do so) but which he still thinks of as his room. Correspondence will now, it is hoped, be dealt with on the day of receipt and all contributions at once acknowledged, for readers may know from their own experience that the letter not answered at once is often for ever unanswered. Back numbers, which for many years have become increasingly jumbled in a series of cupboards, are now being filed by month and year, and when this is finished the unfulfilled orders for a full back file will change their status from Pending to Done.

Brave words, but the Editor is determined to make them true, to the satisfaction of none more than the Editorial Assistant. It is remarkable how many academics seem to make a virtue of untidiness (and illegible handwriting), and the Editor suspects it to be some sort of defence mechanism, against, perhaps, the increasing pressures to which Universities in this country are being subjected, not least from our latest bogeyman, already referred to, the Universities Funding Council. The Editor hears complaints, mostly from Heads of Departments, about the increasing number of returns which they are required to make and assessments to carry out, and the suggestion that the funding of research and teaching be separated, and that Universities will have to bid for students and make their courses attractive to them, is not likely to reduce that load. Traditionally in this country the Head of the Department was also the Professor, and lord in his own domain, so that the responsibilities of the position were more than recompensed by its privileges. But there may be signs (and not only from the increasing appointment of non-Professorial Heads of Department) that the position is ceasing to be attractive to those best able to set an example of dedicated scholarship and who do not care to be no more than managers providing inspired and inspiring leadership.

Another way in which Departments are increasingly endeavouring to demonstrate their liveliness is by Seminars, and almost every day the Editor sees on the Notice Board the announcement of yet another one. Were he to attend all he would like to he might spend all his time on trains or driving (and at his own expense, since funds for such jollies are less lavish than they used to be). Perhaps, as charged by his Department with the organisation of the Greenbank Colloquium on Classical Scholarship (from 6-10 August, details soon, as soon as he gets on top of this number), he is not in a position to complain, but he does feel that the Seminar and Conference business may be getting out of hand. Classics is not like the sciences, where the only way to learn of up-to-date work is by word of mouth: it does not lack for vehicles for publication, and the great scholars of the past carried on a voluminous correspondence, some of it in journals of frequent appearance, which formed, unconsciously, the model for *LCM*.

Much of these notes seems to have been devoted to matters domestic. But *LCM* has always wished, as far as possible, to take readers into its confidence, and once more he thanks those subscribers who have already demonstrated their support by putting their money where their mouth is, even if he has to ask those who have not yet done so by all means to send letters but to send no money now. Heartened by those already received and by those that may be yet to

come the Editor looks forward not only to his retirement, when he can devote all and not just much or even most of his time to *LCM* and its associated enterprises, but also to 1990 and his fifteenth volume, and he and the Editorial Assistant join in the traditional journalistic wish of

A Happy Christmas to all our Readers

and for themselves and for all them

A Prosperous and Productive New Year



Everard Flintoft (Leeds): *Who is the speaker at Agamemnon 489ff?*

LCM 14.10 (Dec. 1989), 147-150

Although the overwhelming majority of scholars since Scaliger have gone against the manuscripts and attributed the lines at *Agamemnon* 489ff. to the Chorus, a series of scholars, including Karsten, Dindorf and A. O. Prickard and, perhaps more significantly, two of the best recent texts, that of Denniston-Page and Page's *OCT*, have followed the lead of the manuscripts and given them to Clytemnestra. It can hardly be said that the issue has been completely settled. Can anything further be said?

Let us first examine the evidence for giving the lines to Clytemnestra. The manuscripts all read KA at 489 and XO at 501. But, as Fraenkel demonstrates in his commentary on 501, all there would have been in the earliest manuscripts is paragraphoi. Hephaestion (*περί σημείων* 10, p.75 Consbruch) gives a detailed account of these in relation to the parabases of comedy, and the Mediceus manuscript (M) has sometimes actually preserved them. Thus, at *Agamemnon* 258, for example, the first hand of the Mediceus only puts the paragraphos, and at *Eumenides* 117 the paragraphos is all there is in the manuscript. The naming of the speaker was, then, a comparatively late development, and the attribution of the lines here to Clytemnestra is a later conjecture which may or may not be validated by other evidence. However, the presence of the paragraphos, which we have hypothesised, surely suggests there must have been some new speaker, and it is difficult to see who else this speaker could have been except Clytemnestra.

It seems we have advanced only to fall back again. However, this is not the case. For there is evidence elsewhere to show that the paragraphos could be used also in other circumstances. It could, for example, be used to show that the coryphaeus had taken over from the Chorus. It could even be used to show that the same person as had been speaking up to that point had now moved from trimeters into lyrics. There is an example of the former at *Persae* 155, where, after the end of the parodos, the coryphaeus changes to dialogue and the Mediceum has a paragraphos together with the sign $\xi\tau\iota\chi^o$ ($\xi\tau\iota \delta \chi\omicron\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$) in front of it, and also at *Choephoroe* 730, where there is a paragraphos when the coryphaeus interrupts the anapaests of the Chorus to announce the arrival of someone new, a possible parallel to this passage here. As regards the second, there is an example at *Prometheus Vincetus* 114, where the paragraphos is there merely to mark Prometheus' switch from iambs to lyrics. All we need suppose, then, is that at this point the coryphaeus takes over from the Chorus as a whole, as in the passage at *Choephoroe* 730, to which I have drawn attention, his function here, too, being to alert us to the arrival of someone new. It is an attractive and economical hypothesis. But we have still not found any evidence to show that it could not be Clytemnestra. If we are to find that, we must, it seems, look elsewhere.

Let us turn to the matter of language and imagery. One striking feature about Aeschylean drama is the way in which links are constantly being forged between imagery and diction and the characters of a play. Now there is some complexity in this. The words and images may be used *either* by the characters *or* by others about the characters *or* in some cases, both. The clearest and most schematic case of the first in our play is Cassandra. One would have to be a literary dunce not to notice the abrupt change in vocabulary and diction as she begins to speak. After the pettifogging arguments of the previous scene, and their concern with finance and 'image', it is as though the walls of the cosmos itself are thrown open to show us for

a moment those same nightmarish forces as we are going to have to face in the final play of the trilogy. An example of the second is the light-imagery which we find one character after another using in connection with the imminent arrival of Agamemnon, or the wolf-imagery which clarifies later round the figure of Aegisthus. Easily the best example of the third is the feminine imagery which is used by the Chorus in a disparaging way about Clytemnestra (though not about Cassandra), and which is taken up defiantly by Clytemnestra herself to vindicate what she has done.

Now what is instantly striking about 489f. is the way in which so much of the initial vocabulary seems designed to cross-reference with words which Clytemnestra has used earlier (and in at least one case is going to use later, too). Thus (i) *λαμπάδων* (489) reminds us of *λαμπάδος* (287), *λαμπάς* (296) and *λαμπαδηφόρων* (312): (ii) *φασφόρων* (489) reminds us of *φάος* (300, 302, 311) and *λαμπαδηφόρων* (312): (iii) *φρυκτωρίων* (490) reminds us of *φρυκτὸς δὲ φρυκτόν* (282), *φρυκτοῦ* (292), and is itself echoed by *φρυκτωρῶν* (590): (iv) *παρallaγὰς* (490) is almost certainly meant to remind us of *ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου* (313). Even to list these is to make oneself aware that something is going on here which is as relevant to Clytemnestra's authority as the repeated re-handling of *δλβος* later is to Agamemnon's supposed well-being (see particularly 837, 928 and 941). But our brief discussion of imagery has also shown us that this does not tell us who actually spoke the lines. We might have an emphatic reassertion by Clytemnestra of what she has already said. On the other hand, the Chorus or coryphaeus may be echoing the words sarcastically, the verbal closeness actually adding to the mockery. All that we can say is that the credentials, and therefore the credibility, of Clytemnestra are under consideration here. We seem to have got no further.

But this is perhaps to despair too easily. No word or phrase exists in a vacuum. In almost all cases, the context in which they appear is germane to the meaning. And if we begin to examine the context here we find something very illuminating. For what we find after the seemingly straight-faced repetition of these awesomely polysyllabic images is that they are almost instantly subjected to an inspection of their verifiability which would have done credit to the late Professor A. J. Ayer in his logical positivist phase. For, regardless of the way in which the passage is to be understood grammatically, what we find is that, having re-presented the chain of beacons in all their glory to our attention, the speaker turns to the cooler matter of whether there is any truth in them at all, or if they are pure fantasy. The first alternative, that they are true, is put forward in a perfunctory and colourless phrase of no more than three words (*εἴτ' οὖν ἀληθεῖς*, half a line). By contrast, the suggestion that they are all an elaborate fantasy is not merely placed in the later, more climactic position within the sentence or expounded at three times the length (9 words, one and a half lines), but also 'fleshed out' with various vividly elaborated images in a series of telling verbal effects.

Thus the beacons are first of all compared to dreams (*ὄνειράτων δλκην*, 491), and this reminds us of the earlier gibe about dreams (*ὄνειρων*, 274), to which the Chorus has so mischievously compared the beacons earlier, to the manifest irritation of the Queen (275 and 277). Furthermore, as the speaker of the lines gets into his or her stride, the important word *φῶς*, a word resonant with earlier uses (*φῶς* at 292, 389, *φάος* at 300, 302, 311) and (in spite of 389) one much more associated with Clytemnestra than with the Chorus, is joined in a violent *iunctura* with the highly unusual *ἐφῆλωσηεν*, the whole unreality of what is envisaged being underlined by the obtrusively spluttering alliteration in the letter *φ* (contrast the kappa alliteration in the lines that follow).

If this is indeed meant as a summary of possible interpretations of what the Queen has reported it is a very 'slanted' one (the prejudice all the stronger, because all the more gratuitous and obtrusive, if we really do take the two *εἴτε* clauses as belated conditionals rather than as a pair of indirect questions). And that we are right to read this into the text is shown by Clytemnestra later on. For when she definitely does come forward at 587 to vindicate her own earlier confidence in the beacons, it is interesting that she not merely uses *πεπορθῆσθαι* (591) to echo the Chorus's earlier sceptical *πεπόρθηται* (278), but also the (not quite

identical) *φρυκτωρῶν* (590) to remind us of *φρυκτωριῶν* here (490: for similar 'three-quarter echoes' compare *δνειρῶν* [274] and *δνειράτων* [491] above). For this passage here at 489ff. is the *only* point at which a word of the *φρυκτωρ*-shape is used in so belittling and tendentious a way. And, what further adds to the conviction that we are on the right lines here, Clytemnestra explicitly locates the use of this word in someone else's mouth (*καί τις μ' ἐνίπτων εἶπε* 590).

It would seem better, then, to interpret the sonorous-sounding nouns of 489f. in a sarcastic rather than self-vindicatory way. And once we accept this, it also becomes possible to see yet further aggressive details within the same passage as line after line adds its own contribution to the already abrasive effect. For if we do retain *φρυκτωριῶν* (490) as the correct reading here – and it would make the 'three-quarter echo' in the form of *φρυκτωρῶν* at 590 all the more pointed if we did (see also *πεπόρθηται* [278] and *πεπορθῆσθαι* [591]) – then it may be no accident that even in these two first lines of the passage every succeeding description of the beacons would be a little less awesome (as well as less polysyllabic) than its predecessor. And the fact that these once carefully and separately delineated marvels, which were described at such length in Clytemnestra's original Beacon Speech, are turned into a perfunctory list of commonplace-sounding plurals similar to those at *Seven against Thebes* 430-431 (*τὰς ἀστραπὰς τε καὶ κεραυνίους βολὰς | μεσημβρίνοισι θάλπεσιν προσήκασεν*), and these mere genitives dependant upon the colourless (and punning) *παραλλαγὰς*, has the effect of reducing the whole thing to some sort of routine 'shopping list' of fantasies.

But this is only a beginning. For there are still further respects in which these lines seem to cast doubt upon Clytemnestra's credentials. For if we go a little further down the passage, we find the relay of the beacons yet again re-described. Here too, it seems to me, there are references to the Queen's earlier speech. Thus *δαίων* at 496 is perhaps meant to pick up *καίονσα* at 301; *ἕλης* at 497 is perhaps a precis of 295 and also perhaps 311; *ὀρείας* at 497 is an echo of *ὄρος* at 303 and *πυρός* at 497 an echo of the same form at 304 and 311. Now it is obvious that there is no such obtrusive and mocking echo here as we met above, rather an impressionistic picture of the Herald racing up to the city from the shore. But this does not mean that there is no satire at all here, merely that it may be achieved in a different way. For there are two points here. First of all we must note the odd inconclusiveness of the actions described here, where, though the flame may have been lit among the brushwood (*δαίων φλόγα | ἕλης* [496-7]), the light, as in so many real bonfires, is soon lost in clouds of billowing smoke (*καπνῷ πυρός* [497]), a sad end to the radiant imagery that begins with the god Hephaestus in person at 281. Secondly we must note that what we have here is a contrast between on the one hand the mere visual charade described in these lines and on the other nothing less than the truth itself speaking aloud: note *οὐτ' ἀναυδος* at 496 and the triumphant *ἐκβάζει λέγων* at 498. As conjecture turns to certainty it is to acquire nothing less than its own miraculous human voice.

There seems no real doubt that in almost every detail in these lines the speaker is attempting to devalue Clytemnestra's earlier claims in the face of the certainty about to be brought by the Herald. And on aprioristic grounds it is far more likely that the Chorus would have undertaken this than the Queen herself. For the most part we rarely cast doubt on our own views – and least of all, perhaps, when they are under attack. In any case, if Clytemnestra did question her own earlier certainties here, it seems surprising that she should have referred to this with such animus later. But there is a further point here, and this centres in the use of grammatical persons.

Let me begin with the curiously unnoticed first person plural in line 489 itself. For it would go against every observable speech-habit of Clytemnestra if we assigned the lines to her. Clytemnestra never uses the first person plural of a verb or any form of *ἡμεῖς* to refer to herself before 1046. And from that point onwards – and this may include that line – only ever uses the first person plural to refer to Aegisthus and herself (see 1552, 1553, 1654, 1656, 1659 and 1673). By contrast, not totally surprising, the Chorus of Elders repeatedly use the plural (see, if necessary, 72f., 584, 1098f., 1213, 1347, 1356, 1367, 1368 etc.). If most such uses are late and

coincide with the establishment of a 'corporate identity' within the Chorus, there cannot be any doubt that the use of a first person plural here would fit in very much better with their way of speaking than with Clytemnestra's. And indeed we may have missed a subtlety in not connecting it with the later 'corporate identity'. But even this is not all that the use of grammatical persons may have to tell us. For it is noticeable that, in drawing the contrast between the bonfires and the Herald to which I have adverted above, the speaker also draws a distinction between two sets of people too. For he associates himself with the Herald at 496, *μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι κάσις*, whereas at 496 he associates the person to whom he is speaking with the bonfires, *σοι δαίω φλόγα*, a reading which is certainly correct in spite of Wilamowitz and others. And whether she is on stage or not, this *σοι* can *only* be the Clytemnestra who has taken such pride in the Beacons earlier. Indeed it may not be without significance for the *σοι* here that she herself actually used the word *μοι* earlier at 312 to express her involvement in the Beacons. For if I am right in detecting in some of the verbal echoes that one can pick up across long numbers of lines what one might call 'verbal combat' between the protagonists, this too might be a slightly snide riposte to that earlier passage.

I hope that this may be sufficient to settle for good and all who it is that speaks the lines from 489 onwards. However, no issue in a literary work exists in a vacuum. Even the reading of one individual word may have its bearing upon the way we read a play. This may be true of the word *σοι* at 496. It is therefore perhaps worth going into one or two of the points that may be clarified by the attribution of these lines to the Chorus. One of the most important features of the first half of the play is the close link between two of its main concerns, its symbolism and its characterisation. Let us take the symbolism first. At one level, the light-imagery which forms the dominant image of this part of the drama is being used to pinpoint both the state of the war itself and the state of the knowledge about it. Thus we find, as the darkness of the Prologue gives way to the light on stage that marks the arrival of the Beacons, war gives way to its aftermath, ignorance and despair to information and hope. As the light of the Beacons is in turn replaced by the light of the sun itself, the aftermath of war gives way to peace, mere information to certainty (in a way reminiscent of a later *Republic*).

But the dramatist is not content to leave this as mere symbolism. He also uses the image to draw out facets both of the Queen's character and of that of the Chorus. For the Beacons are not merely an awesome device, they are also inconclusive. As we listen to Clytemnestra relating the way they have been arranged, what we are first aware of is the first. One will perhaps never know just how often an arrangement so ambitious as that described by Clytemnestra had been employed across an archipelago so disunited as was Classical Greece. I should have thought seldom, if at all. In any event, as Clytemnestra describes it we are brought face to face with the audacity, competence, intelligence and power of a very formidable woman indeed.

However, another feature of beacons must be their inconclusiveness. The fire seen on stage might be all there was. An accident could trigger off a whole sequence. Besides, who is to know what, if any, information is being conveyed? And this enables the dramatist to highlight possible insecurities within the Queen's power, and to raise the issue of the Chorus's attitude to so anomalous a situation as a woman exercising political power. And it is of course within this background that these lines have their importance. The dispute over credentials is no mere academic argument; it is the most naked expression of the power-struggle in the first part of the play (for since the play has the A-B-B-A shape that it does, the same theme reappears in the 'recapitulation section' at 1372ff.). The doubts and rationalisations that were merely implicit at 258ff. are here expressed loudly and contentiously as the Queen is reduced to a mere silly woman (483ff.). And it is an oddly unnoticed, almost Sophoclean, touch that as the Chorus look gleefully forward to hearing a refutation of all that the Queen has said (491) they are about to face someone who will vindicate her totally. Have symbolism and characterisation ever been brought together with more sophisticated effect?

L.A.Holford-Strevens (Oxford): *Varia Gelliana et Annianum* LCM 14.10 (Dec. 1989), 151-153

1. Gellius, NA 5.9.5-6

(5) *Sed et quispiam Samius athleta – nomen illi fuit Ἐκεκλούς – cum antea non loquens fuisset, ob similem causam loqui coepisse.* (6) *Nam cum in sacro certamine sortitio inter ipsos et aduersarios non bona fide fieret, et sortem nominis falsam subici animaduertisset, repente in eum qui id faciebat, uidere sese quid faceret, magnum inclamauit.*

ipsos VPR: *ipsum* C, sicut coniecerat Thysius.

Gone are the days when scholars could be so utterly ignorant of sport as to suppose Eratosthenes' two nicknames of Πένταθλος and Βῆτρα incompatible: but knowledge of ancient sport, though readily available, is insufficiently diffused. Otherwise editors would not have retained the text printed above, translating *ipsos* as 'the Samians' (Rolfe), 'son équipe' (Marache). The Greeks had no team-sports, for the torch-relay did not count as an athletic event; the phrase *in sacro certamine*, which the editors neglect to explain, indicates not that religious ritual but an event at an athletic meeting where the prize consisted of a crown: H. A. Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics* (London 1964), p.153. Even if the sense 'his team' were acceptable, one would have expected Gellius to write not *ipsos* but *suos*; or if the reference be to Samian competitors as such (owing presumably to a political dispute with the host city), whether in Echeclus' event or throughout the games, then we should have expected *ciues suos*.

Harris (p.125), who supposes Echeclus to have been (in this story) a boxer or pancratiast (why not a wrestler?) for whom an unfavourable pairing was contrived, makes him detect 'that the draw was being rigged against him'; indeed Rolfe, despite his translation, had suggested that he was being matched against an unsuitable opponent. But if the injustice was done to Echeclus personally, we must read not *ipsos* but *ipsum*, proposed by Thysius and found in C as well as in one of the *recentiores* (*Casanatensis alter*). I have also found this reading in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS E. D. Clarke 20, and in Chicago, Newberry Library MS 90, written by Milanus Burrus in 1445, on which see Hans Baron, *From Petrarch to Leonardo Bruni: Studies in Humanistic and Political Literature* (Chicago and London 1908), 196-215. *ipsum* yields the necessary sense; it permits the choice of pronoun, namely in preference to the collocation *inter se* not meaning 'between themselves' or 'each other'; it accounts for the other reading, through assimilation of its ending to that of *aduersarios*.

We know that the draw was used to make the pairings in the combat sports; but in epic it determines the line-up in the chariot-race and the order of shooting in an archery contest, and it is hard to see how else starting-places could have been allocated to the runners and throwing- and jumping-order to the pentathletes. Even on our modern tracks one starting-lane is more advantageous than another; in the ancient stadium one runner might have up to fifteen inches further to run than another (Harris p.72) on the first leg of the *diaulos*— a little shorter than our 400m. which we have seen won by a narrower margin. Throwers and jumpers have an obvious advantage by competing after their main rivals have shown then what they must do to win; in the recent Seoul Olympics the men's shot-put and javelin were won by the last throw of the competition. Since in our other account of this affair, Val. Max. 1.8 ext.4, the athlete (there called Echeclus) wins his event but is robbed of his title by the judges, we have no hope of establishing the facts, if any.

Gellius' tale supposes a draw carried out as in Homer (*Il.* 23.352-7; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 5.490-4) by an official's drawing the athletes' names or tokens one by one, not as at Olympia in Lucian's day (*Hermotimus* 40) and in Nonnus' chariot-race (*Dionys.* 37.226-9) by the contestants' drawing lots to indicate their pairing or their starting-place. The latter method may have been introduced after athletes had lost confidence in the former because of such incidents as that in Gellius' story.

2. Annianus fr.2 Morel.

*unde unde colonus Eoae
a flumine uenit Oronti.*

So Terentianus Maurus 1821-2; Apthonius ('Mar. Vict.', *GLK* vi.123.20-21) omits one

unde. Micyllus emended to *Eoi . . . Orontae*, Camerarius to *undae unde*, which recalls Catullus 11.3-4; but although the elision of -ae before a short vowel is not impossible, even in a light metre, for a poet who can write *uua*, *uua sum et una Falerna* (fr.1.1) in the same book of poems (Ter. Maur. 1820), this very verse protects *unde*, *unde* – not of course *undeunde* = *undecumque* but *unde* repeated like *uua* at the start of the line.

It was Lucian Müller who saw that the fragments consisted of a question and an answer; indeed, the repeated *unde*, which he retained, cannot but be interrogative, not relative, but his successors, who prefer single *unde*, recognise that it is livelier as *πόθεν* than as *θεν*. However, Müller's question-mark after *colonus*, though accepted by Bährens (who reads the truly dreadful *mundi unde*, a Germanism for *unde gentium*) and Mattiacci (who makes *undae unde* mean *πόθεν τῆς θαλάττης*), introduces a pause too near the end of the verse for such a short line; Morel rightly preferred to make v.1 a self-contained question answered by v.2.

This, however, leaves the problem of *Eoae*. Bährens had explained it as equivalent to *Eoae partis*; but since Latin affords no parallel, it might seem necessary to read either *undae unde* (so Morel) or *Eoi* understood as a substantive. However, in post-classical Greek *ἡ ἐὼα* may be used absolutely: (Arist.) *Probl.* 946 b14 *αὔρας ἐξ ἐώας συμβάλνει πνεῖν*, Philost. *V S* 2.2.13 (563) *ὁ τὴν ἐώαν ἐπιτροπεύων*, Porphyry, *Antr. Nymph.* 23 (p.72.14 Nauck) *ἥλιος ἐξ αλγοκέρω πρὸς ἐώαν ἐπάνεισιν*; in the late Empire it denotes the *dioecesis* of Oriens. I suggest that Annianus imitated this usage in order to avoid the jingle of *Eoi* with the *Oronti* that he found at Verg. *Aen.* 1.220, albeit of a person, and preferred to *Orontae* or *Orontis* (Priscian, *GLK* ii.245.14). The *colonus Eoae* need not be a person: we should not exclude an imported delicacy or luxury item with a masculine name, personified by the poet of the speaking grape. Nor are we restricted to a fish: *Orontes* may be metonymic for *Syria* as at Prop. 2.23.21 and Juv. 3.62.

3. The fifth eye.

The 'strange *subscriptio*' (P.K.Marshall, *OCT Gellius*, i p.xvii) found following book 12 in the Gellian MS B (Bern. Burgerbibliothek 404 - Leiden, Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit, BPL 1925) is set out anew by B. Munk Olsen, *L'Étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles*, i (Paris 1982), p.397:

*ast oculus quintus uitulum si uiderit intus
quintum post oculum scire putes populum.*

The manuscript was written at some time after 1179 (xii / xiii according to Munk Olsen: xii² Marshall in *Texts and Transmissions*, p.179), possibly in France (Munk Olsen).

The same couplet, save for the less poetic word order *post oculum quintum*, appears at fo.37^{vb} of MS Zentralbibliothek (olim Stadtbibliothek) C.58 (275) – *Katalog der Handschriften der Zentralbibliothek Zurich* i (by L. C. Mohlberg), *Mittelalterliche Handschriften* (Zürich 1952), no.88: see Jakob Werner, *Beiträge zur Kunde der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (2 Aarau 1905), p.79, where it is no.172n in a sequence, or jumble, of gnomic and other verses and distichs, and whence it found its way into H. Walther, *Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sentenzen des Mittelalters in alphabetischer Anordnung* i (Göttingen 1963), s.v. *ast*. This manuscript is dated to the late twelfth century, and ascribed by Werner, p.1, to a German scribe educated in France. He would thus be contemporaneous with the writer of B; if that manuscript was indeed executed in France, the verses may in default of further evidence be supposed to have been disseminated, perhaps even composed, there.

Readers of *LCM* have in the past displayed knowledge in several fields beyond the classical. Is it asking too much to hope that they can throw light on these lines' antecedents, provenance, and meaning (literal, allegorical, tropological, and anagogical)?

4. Gellius NA 17.2.15 (this note has benefited from discussion with Hugh Lloyd-Jones)

. . . *nec ratio dici potest, cur rectius sit 'diuitiis opus esse' quam 'diuitias', nisi qui grammaticorum noua instituta ut ΘΕΜΕΝΩΝ ΙΕΡΑ observant.*

So Gellius' MSS; but from Bussi's *ed. pr.* onwards printed texts have exhibited *τεμενῶν* (generally misaccented *τεμένων*, cf. LCM 10.7 (Jul. 1985), 112) *λερᾶ*, rendered by Bussi's Greek consultant Theodore Gaza *templorum sacra*. The phrase is strange Greek: next to *τεμένη* one expects *λερᾶ* to be linked by a co-ordinating conjunction and mean 'temples'. Yet the transmitted text is unexceptionable; it means *πλὴν ἐλ μὴ τινες τὰ καινὰ δόγματα τηροῦσι τὰ τῶν γραμματικῶν ὥς δὴ θεμένων λερᾶ*, 'as if they had laid down sacred rules'.

5. Which Gellius?

The author of the *Historia Augusta* begins his life of Probus with a resounding *sententia* supported by a stout trio of *auctoritates*: *certum est, quod Sallustius Crispus quodque Marcus Cato et Gellius historici sententiae modo in litteras rettulerunt, omnes omnium uirtutes tantas esse quantas uideri eas uoluerint eorum ingenia qui uniuscuiusque facta discripserint.* (Probus 1.1).

The Sallustian reference, to *Cat.* 8, is unproblematical; knowledge of Sallust is displayed elsewhere (*Sev.* 21.10, *Max. et Balb.* 7.7) and might have been taken for granted. *Marcus Cato* has long been identified as the contrast (fr.83 Peter = *Origines* IV.7 Jordan, IV.7a Chassignet, *ad fin.*) between the fame of Leonidas and that of the Roman *tribunus militum* who led a forlorn hope in the First Punic War; this being the only quotation from Cato in the *HA*, it is likely that the author, like ourselves, knew it through Aulus Gellius, *NA* 3.7.19. What, then, of *Gellius*?

The phrase *Marcus Cato et Gellius historici*, on the face of it, should indicate that the Gellius in question was the annalist Cn. Gellius; but there is no other trace of him in the *HA*, nor is he an author one would expect the biographer to have read. When we recall how often in an ancient author 'as A and B relate' means 'as B cites A as relating', it is natural to follow Hertz in taking *Gellius* to be not Gnaeus but Aulus (*ed. mai.* of A. Gellius, vol. ii, p.vi); this view is adopted by Marache (vol.i, p.vii) and Cavazza (vol.i, p.15) in their editions of the *Nights*. Peter, though admitting the passage as fr.1 of Cn. Gellius, inclines towards Hertz's opinion (*HRR*, vol.i, p.ccviii).

But how, one might object, could Aulus possibly be described as an historian? Peter's explanation, *ex errore quodam seu Vopisci seu [sic] eius quem transcripsit*, implies astonishing ignorance in an age when the *Attic Nights* were widely read; perhaps it is for this reason that P. K. Marshall (*CPh.* 83 [1988], 88) describes Hertz's suggestion as 'bizarre'. However, we surely know our imperial biographer better than to take him at face value. In my *Select Commentary on Aulus Gellius Book 2* (D.Phil. thesis Oxford 1971) I wrote: 'I suspect that he wanted us to think that "Gellius" was Cn. Gellius, but his reason for giving the name was that he had taken his Cato-reference from the *Attic Nights*' (p.4); I would now modify this only to the extent that he may well have expected us to see through his deception and laugh at its shamelessness. It is far easier to credit him with this sleight of hand than with knowledge of Cato's *Origines* and Cn. Gellius' *Annales*.

Copyright © 1989 L. A. Holford -Stevens.

F. M. A. Jones (Liverpool): A note on Lucilius 88-94M.

LCM 14.10 (Dec.1989), 153-154

*'Graecum te, Albuci, quam Romanum atque Sabinum
municipem Ponti, Tritani, centurionum,
praeclorum hominum ac primorum signiferumque,
maluisti dici. Graece ergo praetor Athenis,
id quod maluisti te, cum ad me accedis, saluto:
"chaere" inquam "Tite". Lictores, turma omnis chorusque:
"chaere Tite". hinc hostis mi Albucius, hinc inimicus!'*

Lucilius 88-94M.

M. Scaevola makes fun of the Helleniser Albucius by using the Greek greeting *chaere* and by using the *praenomen*: there is a chiasmic contrast (*Albuci : Tite :: Tite : Albucius*) which emphasises the peculiarity suggestive of Greek practice (see J. G. F. Powell, CQ 34 [1984], 240). The use of *Tite* was clearly pointed and apparently funny enough for the *lictors* and the rest to parrot. While it is possible that the mimicing of the affected use of the *praenomen* was insult enough, it is less obvious that it is sharp enough to be turned into an anecdote in verse satire.

There is evidence that there was a sub-literary word, *titus* for 'dove' or 'pigeon' (F. Bücheler, ALL ii [1885], 118-20: see also A. S. Gratwick, CQ ns23 [1973], 81 n.2), and words for dove are often used for *membrum virile*. The scholiast at Pers.1.20 explains *Titos* (the name) from either Titus Tatius or *certe a membri virilis magnitudine*. It is at least possible that Plautus' name, including Titus, was assumed in urbane irony (so Gratwick 81-2, noting the oddity of the *tria nomina* at this period and social level).

If this is accepted it makes Scaevola's greeting an ingeniously witty *double entendre* worthy of repetition, both abusive and amusing enough to cause the enmity mentioned in the final line of the fragment.

Copyright © 1989 F. M. A. Jones.

Robert Parker (Oriental College, Oxford): *Dionysus at Agrai*

LCM 14.10 (Dec.1989), 154-155

Was Dionysus honoured in the Lesser Mysteries at Agrai, along with *Μήτηρ ἐν Ἀγραις*? Stephanus of Byzantium appears to say so, s.v. Ἀγρα καὶ Ἀγραι: χάριον . . . ἐν ᾧ τὰ μικρὰ μυστήρια ἐπιτελεῖται, μίμημα τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον. E. Gerhard, however, argued in the nineteenth century that Stephanus or his source meant merely that the Mysteries were modelled on Dionysiac rites, in the sense that both contained elements of spectacle; and he has been followed by, among others, Nilsson, Jameson (cautiously) and Graf (*Eleusis und die Orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit*, Berlin 1974, 76, with the earlier references). Indeed, no recent scholar who has considered the matter explicitly appears to have taken a different view. We thus lose our only clue to the contents of the Mysteries at Agrai, as well as an important testimony to the interweaving of cults of Demeter and Dionysus in Attica.

This interpretation, however, misses a very characteristic use of the concept of 'imitation' found in explanations of the origins of festivals. As two examples out of many (assembled almost effortlessly with the help of the invaluable Ibycus computer) we may take Plut. *Thes.*21.1: on reaching Delos Theseus ἐχόροευσε μετὰ τῶν ἡιθέων χορείαν ἣν ἐτι νῦν ἐπιτελεῖν Δηλίους λέγουσι, μίμημα τῶν ἐν τῷ λαβυρίνθῳ περιόδων καὶ διεξόδων; and Rom.29.3-4 ἐξιόντες δὲ πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν (the Nonae Caprotinae) πολλὰ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ὀνομάτων φθέγγονται μετὰ βοῆς . . . μιμούμενοι τὴν τότε (at Romulus' death) τροπὴν καὶ ἀνάκλησιν ἀλλήλων μετὰ δέους καὶ ταραχῆς. ἐνιοὶ μέντοι τὸ μίμημα τοῦτο φασὶ μὴ φυγῆς ἀλλ' ἐπέξεως εἶναι καὶ σπουδῆς, εἰς αἰτίαν τοιαύτην ἀναφέροντες τὸν λόγον. ἐπεὶ Κελτοὶ τὴν Ῥώμην καταλαβόντες ἐξεκρούσθησαν ὑπὸ Καμίλλου . . . Just the same use is found in Plut. Rom.21.8, Cam.33.7, Aristid.17.10, Mor.293c, 361e; and something very close in Athen. *Deipn.*141e, 639f., 701d. Another word for the same concept is *ὑπόμνημα*: the Saturnalia are a *ὑπόμνημα τῆς Κρονικῆς ἐκείνης ἰσονομίας*, for instance (Plut. *Num.*32.11; cf. Rom.21.9, Cam.33.7, Lyc.11.8, Mor.144b, 158a, 357f). The notion of ritual 'imitation' sometimes also converges with that of the ritual 'symbol': thus the egg is consecrated in certain rites ὡς μίμημα τοῦ τὰ πάντα γεννῶντος καὶ περιέχοντος ἐν ἑαυτῷ (Plut. *Mor.*636e, cf. Strabo 10.3.9 [657.23M.]; Rom.21.9).

Festivals, therefore, imitate not other festivals, but aspects of the cosmos or – much more commonly – events in the heroic past. And though a counter-case can be cited, it scarcely supports Gerhard's interpretation. Speaking of the Phliasian Mysteries of Demeter, Pausanias says: καὶ ταῦτα μὲν διάφορα τῶν Ἐλευσίνι νομίζουσι, τὰ δὲ ἐς αὐτὴν τὴν τελετὴν ἐκείνων

ἐστὶν ἐς μίμησιν. ὁμολογοῦσι δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ μιμεῖσθαι Φλιάσιοι τὰ ἐν Ἐλευσίνι δρώμενα (2.14.1, and similarly in a parallel instance in 8.31.7). Pausanias here, very naturally, applies *μίμησις* to a case of direct one-to-one copying within the cult of a single god (the model being, incidentally, the most famous and imitable of all rites). He does not illustrate the far vaguer use postulated for Stephanus, whereby the festival of one god would be said to derive from that of a quite different god, and not because the two rituals were identical but only because of the very general shared characteristic of theatricality.

What of the phrase *τὰ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον*? That it could mean 'Dionysiac rites' would need to be proved; that it is extremely likely to mean 'the story of Dionysus' is clear from, for instance, two expressions found in passages cited by Stephanus himself from other geographers: *τὰ περὶ τὴν Κρεμνυνίαν ἴν* (s.v. *Κρεμνῶν*, from Eudoxos), *τὰ περὶ Θάμυριν* (s.v. *Δώτιον*, from Oros). It is, therefore, beyond reasonable doubt that Stephanus' source wished to claim (whether rightly or not is another question) that the Lesser Mysteries were an 'imitation of the story of Dionysus'.

Copyright © 1989 Robert Parker

Frederick Williams (Queen's University, Belfast): *Giving dogs a bad name*

LCM 14.10 (Dec. 1989), 155-156

At the colloquium of the *Leeds International Latin Seminar* in May 1988 I suggested that when discussing the philosophical outlook of Diogenes of Sinope and his followers we should avail ourselves of the English abstract noun 'Cynism' rather than use the now current term 'Cynicism', with its accretion of sometimes misleading associations. Since some of my auditors on that occasion suspected I was speaking *σπουδαιογελῶς cynico more*, I would like to repeat and amplify my plea in the august pages of this periodical [though later than the Editor had originally intended].

As far as I can discover, all the main languages of Europe have taken over and, with minimal modifications, naturalised the Greek word *κυνισμός* formed from the word *κύων / κυνός*: e.g. French and Catalan have *cinisme*, Italian and Castilian *cinismo*, Polish *cynizm*, and so on. Non-I.E. languages have followed suit: e.g. Turkish *kinizm*, Hungarian *cinizmus*. English, almost alone¹, has formed an abstract noun 'cynicism' from the noun / adjective 'cynic', presumably on the analogy of such terms as 'Stoicism', 'scepticism'.

The English neologism, like so many others, seems to have been coined by Sir Thomas Browne². It is clear that he meant it to be pejorative:

Yet his sober contempt of the world wrought no *Democritism* or *Cynicism*,
no laughing or snarling at it. *A Letter to a Friend*, 1672:
The Works of Sir Thomas Browne, ed. G. Keynes (London 1964), i, p.111.

The form seems thereafter to have fallen into disuse until the nineteenth century, when it came to supplement the more orthodox formation 'Cynism', which the *Oxford English Dictionary* cites as used by Thirlwall in 1833 of the philosophy of Antisthenes.

It is this form 'Cynism' which I propose we should take back into use as a philosophical term. Quite apart from bringing us into line with the rest of the world, this would enable us to draw a useful distinction between the philosophical views of Diogenes (or, if we prefer,

¹ The one surprising exception is Irish. N. O' Dónaill's *Foclóir Gaelige Béarla* (Dublin 1977) lists the form *ciniceas*. My learned colleague Professor G. Stockman informs me that words in Irish corresponding to English words ending in '(ic)ism' are generally formed by adding *-(e)achas* to a stem: *soisialachas*, 'socialism'; *misteachas*, 'mysticism'; when the stem ends in *-ic*, *-eas* is added. Following this pattern *κυνισμός* should be **cineachas* or preferably **coineachas* (since Ir. *coin* is cognate with Gr. *κύων*). It is probably under the influence of the English form that the stem has been taken to be *cinic* and hence the noun *ciniceas* has been formed.

² On Browne's neologisms, see Joan Bennett, *Sir Thomas Browne* (Cambridge 1962), pp.215ff..

Antisthenes), Crates and their fellow-travellers ('Cynism') and the attitude, as the *Concise Oxford English Dictionary* puts it, of 'one who sarcastically doubts human sincerity and merit' ('cynicism'). Such a distinction between *Kynismus* and *Zynismus* is already available in German: the relation between the two concepts is explored by Heinrich Niehues-Probsting, *Der Kynismus des Diogenes und der begriff des Zynismus* (2nd. ed. Frankfurt am Main 1988)³. The gain in clarity and precision, and possibly also in euphony, would be a modest, but worthwhile contribution to the serious study of Cynism.

Copyright © 1989 Frederick Williams

Richard S. Williams (Washington State): *Caesar BG 1.1.1 once again*

LCM 14.10 (Dec. 1989), 156

In LCM 14.5 (May 1989), 80, Kenneth Wellesley suggested that Caesar BG 1.1.1 be emended to read *Gallia est omnis diuisa in partes iu* to avoid the apparent problem of the Helvetii. As the current text is normally read, Caesar declares that Gaul is divided into three parts, lists three, and then begins with a fourth part, Helvetia. Wellesley's emendation, however, is unlikely for two reasons.

First, it would appear that all the surviving manuscripts read *partes tres*, not *partes iii* (at least the Teubner edition does not list any variants at this point). While the degradation of *iu* to *iii* is entirely credible, that of *quattuor* to *tres* is not. In addition to the copyist's error, Wellesley's emendation would require a subsequent change from *iii* to *tres* in a common ancestor of the two extant groups of manuscripts. It makes some sense, perhaps, to believe that a copyist might change a word to a numeral, but why would anyone ever change a numeral to a word?

For the second (and more important) reason, one needs to look again at Caesar's text. After dividing *Gallia* into *partes tres*, Caesar goes on to enumerate the parts. He lists the Belgae, the Aquitani, and the Galli, further commenting that the three groups differ among themselves in language, customs, and laws. He then describes the boundaries between the Aquitani and the Galli and between the Belgae and the Galli. While Caesar uses a place name for the entire area, he uses only names of peoples to identify the various parts of Gallia.

Wellesley comments that 'Gaul as a whole must have included the Helvetii'. Although this is true, the Galli as a division of Gallia also included the Helvetii, as Caesar points out at 1.1.4: *Heluetii quoque reliquos Gallos uirtute praecedunt*. The problem is that Caesar loosely uses the term *Gallia* to include all the lands north of the Pyrenees and west of the Rhine, but in Book 1 he employs the term *Galli* more specifically to include all those tribes not identified as *Belgae* or *Aquitani*. The Helvetii are in the former group, along with their neighbours the Sequani, the Allobroges, and others. Although Caesar occasionally used the term *Galli* to refer to tribes of Belgae and Aquitani (e.g. 3.28), he generally distinguished between them and the Galli (see 2.4). Moreover, when Caesar introduced sections dealing with the Belgae (2.1) and Aquitani (3.20), he referred to each as occupying a third part of Gaul. Had there been four parts, these would have been described as *quarta*, not *tertia*.

Caesar's arithmetic was flawless; and, for once, that poor mediaeval copyist Anonymous was not guilty of a gratuitous error. Caesar described three parts of Gallia, not four. To him *Gallia omnis* was the *prouincia* for his command; the *Galli* were but one segment of its peoples. The apparent confusion in the beginning of the text disappears when one realizes that the Helvetii are a division of the Galli, not a separate division of *Gallia omnis*. The text of *de bello Gallico* is fine as it stands, and Gaul remains divided into just three parts.

Copyright © 1989 Richard S. Williams.

³ I am grateful to Dr T. G. Heinze, of Münster, for drawing my attention to this stimulating book.

Review: C. J. Tuplin (Liverpool)

LCM 14.10 (Dec. 1989), 157-160

P.R. McKechnie & S.J. Kern (ed. & transl.), *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, Warminster, Aris & Phillips, 1988. Pp. iv + 188. £19.50 cloth, £7.50 limp. ISBN 0-85668-357-4 cloth, 358-2 limp.

General observations. This volume contains 28 pages of introduction and 68 pages of commentary, but in many ways its chief significance lies in the text and facing translation which occupy the bulk of the space. For this represents the first complete new printing in one place of all fragments of *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* since the discovery of the Cairo fragment, and the first attempt to produce an English translation of all the fragments known at any one time since the original publication of the London fragments in *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* V.

When Bartoletti printed all the then known fragments as a single Teubner text in 1959 he was tempting fate and fate duly responded (albeit 17 years later) with the Cairo fragment. We can perhaps reasonably hope that the appearance of McKechnie & Kern's volume will have a similar effect, preferably more rapidly. One would, of course, be even more sanguine if they had actually devised a new chapter numeration: this would have virtually guaranteed the eventual discovery of further fragments coming from some spot before the current end of the surviving text. As it is, however, they have retained the chapter numbers assigned by Bartoletti to the material in the Florence and London fragments and inserted the Cairo fragment before this material and *hors de numération*.

Their decision to proceed thus was presumably essentially dictated by the way in which the Greek text is set up: for the Florence and London fragments are simply reproduced photographically from Bartoletti's Teubner, making removal of his chapter and section numbers virtually impossible. The Cairo fragment, by contrast, is not reproduced from *Studia Papyrologica* 15 (1976) but re-typed. This process has introduced some errors: the most notable is ἐκτός for ἐντός in line 22 (the translation follows the correct text), but we also have [.] ω instead of [.] ν in line 5, and a breathing omitted on ὦς in line 18. Although Bartoletti's text is reproduced, his *apparatus criticus* is replaced by a much simpler one constructed by the editors. The information it contains is largely derived from Bartoletti but there are some novel items, e.g. new readings suggested by Michael Crawford (καὶ δέκα at 4.2 [adopted in the translation] and ἐλάμβαν' ἄν at 5.2) and by McKechnie himself (22[17].4 παρα[σκ]ευδ[ζων μετὰ] τὸν ἐπλέοντα χειμῶνα) and various palaeographical observations by McKechnie based on new examination of the London Papyrus.

Translation is only attempted when there is enough text surviving or reconstructable to make it seem worthwhile. (Sometimes the judgement of this matter is odd: the isolated words [τὸ] Κα[ύς] τρι[ου πεδίου] in 11[6].2 are translated, but the similarly isolated reference to the Kaunian river and *limne* in 9[4].3 is not, though it is of some interest [enough to get a note in the commentary]). The result is that the right hand (translation) page is often a good deal less full than the left hand one and is sometimes totally blank.

This cannot, of course, be helped. But there is nonetheless some room for mild complaint about the result. The translation is always positioned on its page with the first printed line opposite the first printed line of the text page, irrespective of whether the latter is actually represented in the translation; and the printed lines of the translation proceed down the page in standardized spacing with no reference to the layout of the text page and with individual numbered chapter sections only sometimes set off as separate paragraphs. The consequence is that there are some double spreads in which the horizontal relationship of text and translation gets badly skewed (e.g. 54-5, 56-7, 72-3). There seems to be no good reason why this should have been allowed to happen. It would similarly have been helpful if the dots used in the translation to show that the translatable text is not continuous did not always come in groups of three irrespective of the length of the lacuna (the translation of the latter part of 20[15].1 is a notable example of this problem). It seems reasonable to assume that this volume will be used by those whose Greek is weak, perhaps very weak. The layout may not encourage them to persevere in their attempts to match translation and original.

Introduction. This contains four sections. A ("The Papyri") gives a succinct description of the three sets of fragments and justifies their treatment as part of a single work. (There is, incidentally, more to be said about the *recto* of the London fragment than appears in the current literature.) An observation of Treu that the Theramenes papyrus (*P.Mich.*5982) might also be part of *Hell.Oxy.* (or rather that nothing proves that it is not) is noted but rejected. (This is perhaps more publicity than Treu deserves). B ("Work on the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*") surveys scholarship on the text in the 80 years since Grenfell & Hunt published the London fragments. 9 pages is scant space for such an exercise. In the event McK./K. comment briefly on reactions to the contrasts and discrepancies between *Hell.Oxy.* and what is found in Xenophon, noting that the long tradition of assuming that *Hell.Oxy.* is better or more truthful because more circumstantially detailed is now being criticized in some quarters, but otherwise (unsurprisingly) they concentrate on the question of authorship.

Their position is that the question remains open, but: (i) Ephorus and Androtion are definitely to be excluded; (ii) Daimachos is not to be mocked; (iii) Kratippos should not be ruled out of court by being wrongly downdated to the Hellenistic period; (iv) Theopompos has marginally the strongest claim among authors known by name. (McK./K., incidentally, never explain lucidly either here or in the Commentary the bearing of Porphyry's remarks on plagiarism [cf. *F.Gr.H.* 115 T 21] on the question.) The sort of robustly personal, not to say prejudiced, view about Athenian and other political groupings evinced in *Hell.Oxy.* is not perhaps impossibly remote from the frame of mind one associates with the mature Theopompos of the *Philippika*, even if the style is hardly rhetorical. But in view of the relationship between *Hell.Oxy.* and Diodorus, the implication of McK./K.'s position is that Ephoros' account of the earlier 4th century was actually based rather closely on Theopompean *juvenilia*. Is this really likely – or likely not to have been the subject of surviving comment?

After C ("Background to the period covered") we come to the at first sight startling heading D "The *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* as literature". Any thought that we are to be treated to the titillation of an attempt to persuade us of *Hell.Oxy.*'s literary qualities proves unfounded. Quite the reverse – there are many digressions 'which to the modern reader at least can seem tiresome', too small a range of vocabulary and too little effort to avoid monotony in sentence structure. The latter two judgements will provoke little disagreement. The first is over-harsh – and indeed McK./K. themselves seem subsequently to distance themselves from it. For one thing, the truth is that the prevalence of digression is easily overstated. So far as stylistic judgements go, 18[15].3, 19[16].2 and 21[16].4 are hardly substantial enough to be noted (and in the Commentary the authors actually observe anyway that 19[16].2 is part of a rather carefully constructed piece of narrative). It is only 7[2].1-5 and 16[11].2-4 plus 17[12].2-5 that are really relevant, and one should not forget that in the original state of the text these stood much further apart than they do now. One should not too readily succumb to the feeling that there is an intrinsic stylistic fault here.

If one is to raise any question about such passages it, should rather be to wonder, for example, how it could be that some of the material in 7[2].1-5 had not already appeared in the narrative and (more generally) what was the overall disposition of the Timokrates mission in *Hell.Oxy.*'s narrative. It is possible that, if we had a complete text, we should perceive a certain clumsiness in this area. At any rate, it is the nature of the digressions and their interconnection with the general narrative, not merely their number, that must be investigated before stylistic criteria can be essayed.

Translation.

1.1. 'on the road . . . leading to the city'. The dots are superfluous.

7[2].2 a slight lacuna in the text is not marked in the translation.

τὸ . . . πολλὴν ἀγρονομεῖν, 'a vigorous policy'. This surely fails to get the appropriate overtones (especially bearing in mind the bias of the author, of which McK./K. are well aware).

9[4].2 [ἀφικνεῖται Πόλλις] ναύαρχος ἐκ Λακεδαιμόνων εἰς τὴν ναυαρχίαν τῇ]ν Ἀρχελαΐδα κατα[εἰς δὲ διδοχός]: 'Pollis came . . . as admiral, in succession to the command of Archelaidas'. I should much prefer to retain 'navarch' and 'navarchy' for the Spartan fleet commander and his office. But in any case the translation here should retain the repetition of ναύαρχος / -ίαν. There is no cause to palliate the inelegance of the original and (bearing in mind this time the prospective entirely Greekless reader) it is important that technical terms should be translated consistently.

11[6].4 [ὅταν γένωνται] βαδίζοντες[ε] κατ' αὐτούς, 'when the Persians happened to be coming against them'. But the sense is surely 'when the Persians reached their vicinity'. The phrase is part of the instructions for the springing of an ambush against the Persians as they pursue Agesilaos' main army. Compare 21[16].2, ὡς ἦσαν κατ' αὐτούς, 'when they were close by' (as McK./K. themselves translate it).

[οἱ μὲν] αὐτῶν προσέβαλλον[ον] τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, οἱ δὲ περ[ι]ίππε[υ]νον αὐτούς, οἱ δὲ κ[α]τὰ τὸ πεδίον ἀτάκτως ἐπηκολούθουν, 'some . . . attacked the Greeks, others rode around them and others began to pursue them across the plain in an undisciplined fashion'. It is not clear why one and only one of these imperfects is treated as inceptive.

11[6].5 τῶν δὲ βαρβάρων ὡς εἶδον ἕκαστοι προσθ[έ]ον[τας] τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐφευγον, 'when the barbarians saw the Greeks charging at them, they fled'. ἕκαστοι is thus omitted.

14[9].2 δη[μο]τικώτα[τος], 'very democratic' – not necessarily entirely appropriate in context, especially if (as McK./K. think) Agesilaos or the younger Kyros is the person in question.

16[11].3 συντελούντων εἰς τὰς Θήβας, 'subject to Thebes'. Rather 'counting as part of Thebes' or 'forming part of Thebes' (cf. *Athenaion* n.s.64 [1986], 324f., 339).

17[12].3 ὅτε γὰρ πολεμοῦντες . . . γὰρ is ignored in the translation.

19[17].2 περ[ι]ορῶσιν ἐνίοτε καταλυομένης τὰς αὐτῶν [δυνάμ]εις, 'they sometimes permit the disbandment of their forces'. 'Permit' is too positive; rather 'acquiesce in' or even 'fail to prevent'.

20[15].3 οἱ δὲ Κύπριοι τοὺς Μεσσηνίους] . . . [βδ]αλ[οντες] ἀπεκρο[ν]σαν, 'The Cypriots, having attacked the Messenians . . . drove them off'. [βδ]αλ[οντες], not [ἐπιβδ]αλ[οντες], ought to mean that the Cypriots threw things at the Persians.

20[15].5 τοὺς μὲν [ἐξ]ώθεν αὐτοῦ τοῦ στρατοπέδου περιέστηεν, τοὺς [δὲ . . .] . . .] γὰρ πρὸς τὰς ναῦς κατὰ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν [διετάξατο], 'then he positioned some outside the camp, others . . . near the ships and seashore'. The fact that [διετάξατο] is restored does not mean that it should not be translated. Read 'he placed some round the outside of the camp and drew up others .etc.'.

Commentary, p.119, Cairo Frag. line 12f.: the commentary never actually explicitly points out that the sea has retreated west from Ephesos since antiquity; are all prospective readers, for whom rather elementary information is sometimes thought necessary, supposed to know this?

p.124, 3.1: βασιλέ[ως]. 'Virtually certain to be a reference to the King of Persia'. True, no doubt, but it is a matter of general apparent context and not of the fact that 'the word *basileus* almost always has this reference in fourth century Greek'. Since the preceding letters are lost we cannot tell whether the definite article was missing, which is the only thing that might settle the issue.

p.132, 6[1].1: *pace* McK./K. the narrative about Demainetos proves nothing about the possibility of secret *diplomatic* dealings, at least in any sense of the word 'diplomatic' that seems worth assenting to.

pp.133, 135, 6[1].3, 7[2].1: McK./K. fail to make clear where they think Epikrates and Kephalos fit into the groupings of Athenian politics; and the comment 'Cephalus was another democratic politician' is hardly an adequate reflection of what is known about him.

p.134, 6[1.3: 'Milon, the harmost of Aegina' would seem to deserve a note, if only on his office.

p.135, 7[2].2: McK./K. compare *Hell. Oxy.*'s strong line on the relationship between Timocrates' gold and the outbreak of the Corinthian War with 'Thucydides' near obsession with the mistaken Athenian tradition about the tyrannicides', a strange comparison, when

Thucydides' equally and outrageously obsessive attitude about the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War (taken to the point of suppressing facts about the Megarian Decree lest his readers be seduced away from the Thucydidean truth) would appear to be a much more apposite parallel.

p.137, 8[3].2: McK./K. fail. to draw attention to the naming of Pharnabazos rather than Tithraustes (Xen., *Hell.* 3.5.1) in connection with Timocrates' gold.

p.137, 8[3].2: a pity not to draw attention to the fact that Demainetos' ship, fresh from the Athenian ship-sheds (so one might suppose) was in worse condition than one captured from Milon. Moreover, if Milon only took one trireme against Demainetos (8[3].1), why does *Hell. Oxy.* apparently say (8[3].2) that Demainetos seized 'one of [Milon's] ships'? (I do not think that we can reasonably claim that this ship was something other than a trireme, especially since the author also uses *naus* in this very same passage of Demainetos' vessel, which was certainly a trireme (6[1].1).

p.151, 15[10].3: it is a little surprising to find no reference to the most famous of the Diagoreioi, the Olympic victor Dorieus, who had emigrated to Thourioi but played a notable anti-Athenian role in the latter part of the Peloponnesian War (including activities in Rhodes itself). The fact that Athens had once condemned Dorieus and his *sungeneis* to death only makes it all the more interesting that in the 390s the Diagoreioi were willing to co-operate with Konon against Sparta. Dorieus, who was in the Peloponnese at the time of this *volte face*, was the first to pay the penalty for it, being arrested and executed by the Spartans.

p.151, 15[10].1: if it is worth noting that 'Harpocraton records that Hieronymos became an Athenian general (it is not known when) and that he was referred to by Ephorus in this eighteenth and nineteenth books', then it would be worth noting that Nikophemos was later installed by Pharnabazos and Konon as 'harmost' of Kythera, and saying something about the information about him and his son Aristophanes to be found in Lysias 19.

p.165, 17[12].5: '[Attica] had suffered only slight damage'. A reference to V. Hanson, *Warfare and Agriculture in Classical Greece* (Pisa 1983) would be in order here.

pp.175, 182, 22[17].3: the map on p.175 puts Daskyleion in the wrong place, i.e. on the coast north of Lake Apollonia instead of inland and further west on the shores of Lake Manyas. There may indeed be a problem with *Hell. Oxy.*'s account, in which Agesilaos marches from Miletou Teikhos along the Rhyndakos to Lake Daskylitis, below which (ὅφ' ἣ) lies Daskyleion – a story which would *prima facie* locate Daskyleion on Lake Apollonia. But the archaeological evidence as to the location of Daskyleion is clear, and McK./K.'s map, on which Miletou Teikhos is on Lake Apollonia and Daskyleion is on the coast is inconsistent with the *prima facie* implications of *Hell. Oxy.* anyway. The map also fails to label the R. Sangarios, mentioned in 22[17].2 and wrongly called 'Sangarion' in the translation.

Copyright © 1989 C. J. Tuplin

